



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/721,135	11/25/2003	Robert Kronenberger	00130P0146US	6333

32116 7590 03/06/2007  
WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ, CLARK & MORTIMER  
500 W. MADISON STREET  
SUITE 3800  
CHICAGO, IL 60661

EXAMINER
----------

SUTTON, ANDREW W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3765

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/06/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/721,135	KRONENBERGER, ROBERT	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Andrew W. Sutton	3765	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 January 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 November 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

The examiner withdraws the final rejection made on 10/13/06 due to failure to specifically address claim 1 in the claim rejection. The examiner corrects this error in the following office action.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

In regards to the claim 112 rejection, the rejection is withdrawn in view of the applicant's response.

Applicant's arguments filed 1/22/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive and the rejection stands.

The applicant argues that the indicia of the device modifies the structure of the cap as being analogous to the example of Miller. The examiner disagrees with this argument as the indicia of Miller modifies how the measuring cup is used due to the new indicia adjust how the user would use the cup. The cap of the applicant provides information of an event with further information of the teams. The addition of this information does not change how the cap is used and still functions identically as it does without this information. The examiner fails to see how the indicia structurally modifies the cap.

For further reasoning, the examiner admits that the information of Loeffelholz and Kronenberger are not the same as claimed by the applicant. However, the examiner submits that since the only difference between the applicant's article of manufacture and that disclosed by Loeffelholz and Kronenberger is in the content of the information set for by the indicia, then this difference does not set forth a patentable distinction. It

has been held that when the claimed printed matter is not functionally related to the substrate it will not distinguish the invention from the prior art in terms of patentability. Therefore, when the prior art describes all the claimed structural and functional relationships between the descriptive material and the substrate, but the prior art describes a different descriptive material than the claim, then the descriptive material is non-functional and will not be given patentable weight. (citing, *In re Ngai*, 367 F.3d 1336, 70USPQ2d 1862 (Fed. Cir. 2004)),

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-15, and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loeffelholz (US 6,175,963) in view of Kronenberger (US 6,370,696). Loeffelholz illustrates a hat in fig. 2 including a logo 32 that are can be placed at various points around the circumference of the crown portion of the hat. The hat has a front, rear, left and right side as the applicant claims. The hat of Loeffelholz has the eight octants claimed since, as the applicant states, "the octants are not discernable, viewable divisions" and have no structure. The hat of Loeffelholz has a forwardly extending brim 24 with not other brims protruding from the hat and is a conventional style cap. Loeffelholz does not explicitly disclose a front right or left side identifying an

Art Unit: 3765

event or showing a plurality of participants on the various rear and side octants claimed. Kronenberger discloses a cap in Figs. 1-5 and 10-15 that discloses various designs that include school, object, information, team, email, etc. at various points around the cap. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to place the information such as sporting event, and participants on a cap in the various positions claimed. Further, it is the opinion of the examiner that the information claimed, provides no structure to the cap that is not shown in the prior art are mere design choices. In regards to aesthetic design changes, *In re Seid*, 161 F.2d 229, 73 USPQ 431 (CCPA 1947), "The court found that matters relating to ornamentation only which have no mechanical function cannot be relied upon to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art." The applicants claims no structural limitations that the prior does not show, as stated in the previous and current office actions.

As to claims 2-3, 6-8, 11-14, and 16-18, the claims provide no structural limitations to the cap and are mere design choices of logos/information that would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Whether or not a person can see or identify a logo/information would be based on totally a specific situation as to where the viewer is viewing the hat and also provides no structure limiting the hat. The various placement of logos and information provide no structural limitations over the prior art and also are mere design choices and would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as shown in Figs. 1-5 and 10-15.

As to claim 5, Kronenberger illustrates in Fig. 13 the hole number on a golf course being placed on the hat at the bill 24.

As to claim 9, Kronenberger illustrates the crown portion 10 of the cap being an inverted cup shape as shown in Fig. 13.

As to claim 15, Kronenberger discloses that logos can be embroidered (Col. 2 line 24).

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loeffelholz (US 6,175,963) in view of Kronenberger (US 6,370,696) in further view of Park (US 6,408,443). Loeffelholz/Kronenberger teaches the device substantially above. However Loeffelholz/Kronenberger does not teach the use a hat that is made in the form of a visor. Park teaches (Fig. 2) that hats including logos 11 can have an opening 1 in the crown area. It is commonly known in the art to make hats in the form visors. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Loeffelholz/Kronenberger and Park to give a hat that would allow for increase airflow.

Claims 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loeffelholz (US 6,175,963) in view of Kronenberger (US 6,370,696) in further view of Armstrong (US 5,584,076). Loeffelholz/Kronenberger teaches the device substantially above. However, Loeffelholz/Kronenberger does not teach the use of an adjustable strap along with an opening with a logo provided on the adjustable portion of the hat. Armstrong illustrates in Fig. 1 an opening in the back of the hat with an adjustable strap 20 located across the opening. A logo 46 is located on the hat. Armstrong does not explicit state that the logo identifies an event. However, the applicant does not state any unexpected results or criticality as to why the logo must identify an event. The examiner feels that the logo of Armstrong is capable of identifying an event. It would

Art Unit: 3765

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the opening and strap of Armstrong to the hat of Loeffelholz/Kronenberger to provide adjustability in the hat to allow for the ability of wearer's with multiple head sizes.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew W. Sutton whose telephone number is (571) 272-6093. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary L. Welch can be reached on (571) 272-4996. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



AWS  
23 February 2007

**GARY L. WELCH**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700**